DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 086 PS 024 602

AUTHOR Wasson, Rebecca; And Others
TITLE Development and Piloting of the Prosocial Attitude Blank.
INSTITUTION Memphis State Univ., TN. Center for Research in Educational Policy.
PUB DATE Nov 94
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Education Research Association (Nashville, TN, November 9-11, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aggression; *Child Behavior; Cognitive Development; Cognitive Style; *Ethical Instruction; *Ethics; Family Environment; Friendship; Helping Relationship; Interpersonal Relationship; *Moral Development; Moral Values; Peer Relationship; *Prosocial Behavior; Risk; *Social Behavior; Social Development; Social Values; Values
IDENTIFIERS Kohlberg (Lawrence); Mid South Educational Research Association; *Prosocial Attitude Blank

ABSTRACT

The Prosocial Attitude Blank (PAB) was designed to assess interpersonal values and ethical awareness of elementary school children. PAB was administered to 405 elementary students as one component of the evaluation of an intervention program designed to reduce interpersonal conflicts, increase literacy skills, and enhance children's ethical behaviors. PAB's conceptual model synthesized contemporary thinking on social helping behaviors. The instrument contained five "pretend" situations involving varying relationships to persons-in-distress: self, sibling, friend, unknown peer, and unseen other of nonspecific age. Students were asked what they would do, and their reason for the action, in an open-ended format. Potential costs of ameliorating distress were not stated in the instrument's items; instead, students were allowed to project costs as reasons for their actions. Pilot findings suggested that prosocial development might be more complex than previously believed. Rather than considering children's ethical awareness and behaviors in terms of developmental sequences across situations, it might be more appropriate to consider them in terms of changing contextual factors in children's understanding of their world and relationships therein. (Contains 9 references.) (Author/BGC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 400 086

CENTER FOR RESEARCH IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY

The University of Memphis

Memphis, TN 38152

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Development and Piloting of the Prosocial Attitude Blank

Rebecca Wasson
Blake Burr-McNeal
Suzanne B. Huffman
Gordon E. Kenney
Lu Clement
Bonnie Parnicky

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rebecca Wasson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Presented as a poster display at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Education Research Association

Nashville, TN
November 9-11, 1994

The University of Memphis is one of 46 institutions in the Tennessee Board of Regents sytem, the seventh largest system of higher education in the nation. It is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action university committed to education of a non-racially identifiable student body.

PS 024602

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The Prosocial Attitude Blank (PAB) was designed to assess interpersonal values and ethical awareness of elementary school children. PAB was administered to 405 elementary students as one component of the evaluation of an intervention designed to reduce interpersonal conflicts, increase literacy skills, and enhance children's ethical behaviors. PAB's conceptual model synthesized contemporary thinking on social helping behaviors. The instrument contained five "pretend" situations involving varying relationships to persons-in-distress: self, sibling, friend, unknown peer, and unseen other of nonspecific age. Students were asked what they would do, and their reason for the action they would take, in an open-ended format. Potential cost of ameliorating distress were not stated in the instrument's items; instead, students were allowed to project costs as reasons for their actions. Pilot findings suggests that prosocial development might be more complex than previously believed. Rather than considering children's ethical awareness and behaviors in terms of developmental sequences across situations, it might be more appropriate to consider them in terms of changing contextual factors in children's understanding of their world and relationships therein.

Development and Piloting of The Prosocial Attitude Blank

The Prosocial Attitude Blank (PAB) was designed in 1993 by personnel of the Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis. PAB was one component of the evaluation of the first year's implementation of "Voices of Love and Freedom," an ethical awareness intervention developed collaboratively by Family, Friends and Community and the Judge Baker Children's Center of Boston, Massachusetts. "Voices of Love and Freedom" was a kindergarten through twelfth grade multicultural, ethics, and literacy program which sought to promote students' positive interpersonal relationships by increasing ethical awareness and decreasing risk-taking behavior. The objective in designing PAB was to find a means to assess interpersonal values and ethical awareness of children at the elementary school level. The focus of this paper is on the children's' perspectives which emerged from the data of the pilot administration of PAB. More complete findings of the intervention's evaluation are presented elsewhere (Suriani & Wasson, 1994).

For the past thirty years, Kohlberg's theory of moral development has been the accepted explanation for differences found in humans' moral and ethical thinking and behavior. One criticism of Kohlberg's theory is that it views children's moral development as unvarying sequence of stages in the evolution of a child's egotism. Kohlberg's theory has also received criticism for failing to acknowledge the influence of children's differentiated gender roles which tends to socialize girls to emphasize caring and connectedness to others as a bases for moral decisions and to socialize boys to emphasize independence and justice (Gilligan, 1982). It is possible that relational experiences are not specific to gender, but rather describe all children's evolving moral and ethical conscience.

Collins and other contemporary educational philosophers (Rich and DeVitis, 1985) argue that society assumes a share of the responsibility in moral development. This argument is founded in the ideas of Durkheim who posited that humans partake of a double

existence, one a biological existence and the other as an extension of society. Within Durkheim' vision of moral development, morality occurs only within the societal existence, and education's end is "to constitute this being [social] in each of us" (Chazan, 1985, p.10). Dewey, Durkheim's contemporary, similarly concurred, "development is both biological and tied to evolving social structures" (Collins, 1987, p. 94).

Investigators from diverse fields, including Thomas Kuhn, Clifford Geertz, Richard Rorty, and Stanley Fish, have built on Dewey's and Durkheim's conviction that society and education have a role in moral development and have further suggested that

> . . . there is a strong element of communitarian interest that enters into the way in which knowledge develops. Schools, therefore, in addition to having the motive of establishing and disseminating objective knowledge, also have the motive of sustaining open-ended conversations. In addition, school is often a domain of self-development in which student pursue motives of self-identification and self-protection. It is likely that each of these motives should be attended to "in the long run" of schooling. (Collins, 1987, p. 96).

Development of PAB

The theoretical model used in designing PAB is a synthesis of contemporary thinking on social helping behaviors, with special emphasis given to sources cited in the background literature provided by "Voices of Love and Freedom." The conceptual framework draws on a model of risk-taking behavior as described by Levitt, Selman, and Richmond (1991). This model is in the tradition of Dewey and Durkheim in that one of its stated goals is "to understand how the development of these [developmental psychological] factors varies as a function of the individual's biological make-up and socio-cultural context" (p. 352).

For the purpose of this instrument, "risk" is defined as interpersonal behaviors which (a) inhibit or disrupt the learning process of a student or a class, and/or (b) threaten

the student's physical well-being. Specific examples of "risk" behavior include fighting, bullying, ostracizing, stealing, breaking promises, tattling, and overt and intentional challenging of authority, as well as risk behaviors more commonly identified by society such as substance abuse and criminal activity (Levitt, Selman, & Richmond 1991)..

According to Levitt, et al., there are three psychosocial components of the human development that influence risk-taking behaviors: knowledge of the "risk," social management skills, and personal meaning attached to the "risk." The model assumes the three components undergo transformations as the child acquires new experiences, skills, and information. In addition, the model is extended to include the child's socio-cultural context as a major factor influencing development of personal meaning.

Keller and Edelstein (1985) provide a slightly different perspective on Levitt, Selman, and Richmond's model of ethical reasoning. Keller and Edelstein hypothesize that the "types of reasons" which a child gives for situational behavior are influenced by the relationships of the child to other persons within the situation (p. 8). Therefore, the model offered by Levitt, et al., can be further expanded to include the child's understandings of relationships.

PAB is intended to detect the child's reasoning within the three components of psychosocial development. Additionally, PAB was designed and analyzed to incorporate Keller and Edelstein's thesis so that personal meanings of relationships could be detected.

The PAB instrument contains five "pretend" situations, involving varying relationships to the person-in-distress: self, sibling, friend, unknown peer, and unseen other (nonspecific age).

1. Student interaction with a friend. *Pretend that you have borrowed a ball from a friend in your neighborhood and you lose the ball.*

2. Student empathy with a peer who is not a friend. *Pretend that you see another child at school, whom you do not know, being picked on and called names.*

3. Student relationship and involvement with community. *Pretend that you are in a store in your neighborhood. You find a wallet with money in it.*

4. Student response to authority. *Pretend that a teacher accuses you of cheating when you did not cheat.*

5. Student/family relationship. *Pretend that you see your little brother or sister steal candy from a store.*

The instrument was designed in an open-ended format. Guidelines for administering the instrument specify that students should be asked what they would do, and why. Because potential costs of actions are not stated within the instrument, students are allowed to project such costs as reasons for their actions.

Participants

Nine elementary teachers in self-contained classrooms began implementing the program during Fall 1993. The school concentrated its pilot implementation in the first grade. Therefore, all three first grade classes implemented the program. In the second, third, fourth, and sixth grades, one class was selected to implement the program. Two fifth grade classes participated in the program because both teachers' expressed strong interest. PAB was administered to students in all nine intervention classes.

For purposes of comparison, PAB was also administered to students in classes which were not implementing the program. The first, second, fifth, and sixth grades provided one comparison class per grade. Through miscommunication with school personnel and in response to one teacher's request, grades three and four furnished two comparison classes each. Therefore, PAB was administered to students in eight comparison classes. In all, 405 elementary students completed the PAB instrument either in the Fall of 1993, six months later in the Spring of 1994, or at both times.

Of the 405 students who completed the PAB instrument, only 263 students were included within the data analysis. Students were excluded from analysis either because

data were not available for both Fall 1993 and Spring 1994 administrations or because students were transferred mid-year from non-intervention classes into intervention classes.

Administration of the Instrument

PAB was designed so that it could be administered one-on-one, with the examiner reading items out loud and recording the child's responses. However, PAB's authors designed the instrument so that upper-elementary students could read all six items with ease. According to the Flesch-Kincaid (1975) readability formula, the first four items of the instrument require a second-grade reading level. The fifth item requires a first-grade reading level. PAB guidelines recommend that in second through fourth grade classes, the examiner read each question out loud, allowing the students adequate time to record their written responses. The guidelines further suggest that in fifth and sixth grade classes, students read and respond independently to the six items. Guidelines stress that the examiner must assure that in all administration situations each student understands that the student himself or herself is the subject of the "pretend" situations. The examiner must also take precautions not to cue the students to an "acceptable" answer.

The Fall 1993 and Spring 1994 administrations of the instrument were considered pilot administrations. All examiners were staff researchers who had participated in the development of PAB, thus examiner training was not an issue. The first grades received one-on-one administration. Examiners found that there were occasions when first graders had to be assured that there were "no right answers." The one-on-one administration was, however, time consuming. In grades two through six, the examiner read each item aloud, and then waited until all students had finished writing before going to the next item. In these instances administration seldom took more than thirty minutes per class.

Analysis

Three independent raters constructed response categories from the collected data. The coding scheme was then triangulated by multiple raters. Discrepant responses were examined, and rater consensus was reached.

Analysis consisted of examination of action and reason response patterns by situation, grade level, and intervention status. Many students listed several actions. The raters were somewhat surprised to find that although there were many instances where multiple actions were given, in no instance did a child give more than one reason. In cases of multiple actions, the reason was recorded as an explanation of the first action. Second and third action responses were also recorded. The raters based these decisions on their observation that the majority of multiple-action responses were constructed using "and" rather than "or."

Action responses are summarized in Tables 1 through 8. It was found that more qualitative approaches were appropriate for analysis of reason responses. Within this qualitative analysis, reason responses were viewed within the context of the action.

Findings of Pilot Administration

Item 1. *Pretend that you have borrowed a ball from a friend in your neighborhood and you lose the ball.*

First action responses for Item 1, *Student interaction with a friend*, fell into six categories:

- Look/find
- Replace
- Tell (e.g., "I lost the ball")
- Sorry (e.g., "Tell my friend I'm sorry I lost the ball")
- Tell parent (e.g., "Tell my mom to solve the problem")

Responses that could not be deciphered by the coders were placed in a category accordingly. The major action categories are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Percentage First Action Response to Item 1 as a Function of Grade and Intervention Status

	Comparison Classes			Intervention Classes		
Response	N	Fall	Spring	N	Fall	Spring
Grade 1	18			53		
Look/find		55.6	38.9		32.1	34.0
Replace		33.3	22.2		24.5	35.8
Tell		0.0	33.3		22.6	26.4
Grade 2	16			16		
Look/find		62.5	37.5		50.0	62.5
Replace		12.5	18.8		43.8	18.8
Tell		12.5	37.5		0.0	0.0
Grade 3	37			13		
Replace		48.6	32.4		38.5	7.7
Tell		29.7	45.9		38.5	76.9
Grade 4	29			17		
Replace		24.1	48.3		58.8	35.3
Tell		62.1	37.9		29.4	52.9
Grade 5	11			28		
Look/find		18.2	27.3		28.6	14.3
Replace		36.4	27.3		17.9	28.6
Tell		45.5	45.5		50.0	46.4
Grade 6	17			20		
Replace		35.3	29.4		30.0	35.0
Tell		64.7	52.9		45.0	55.0

First and second graders strongly believed that if they were to look for the ball they would find the ball. A belief in the effectiveness of personal effort surfaced again in the fifth grade -- however with somewhat less conviction. Third, fourth, and sixth graders did not consider looking for the ball to be a solution to the problem.

From the third grade through the sixth grade, confessing to the friend that the ball was lost was important. There were notable gains in the frequency of "telling" between administrations of the instrument in the intervention classes.

"Sorry" was not a prevalent first action choice in grades one through four and did not become prevalent in the fifth grade until the Spring administration. As a second or third action choice, it increased in frequency in the higher grades (Table 2). Among fourth, fifth, and sixth grade responses, the action of "telling" was frequently accompanied by the action of "sorry." This pattern was especially apparent in the fourth grade intervention class's Spring administration of the instrument.

The following categories of reasons emerged from the data of Item 1:

- Restating of the Problem (e.g., "the ball was lost")
- Principle (e.g., "it's the right thing to do" or "I lost it")
- Relationship (e.g., "it's my friend's ball")
- Consequences to Other (e.g., "she won't have to buy another")
- Consequences to Self (e.g., "I want to be nice" or "I don't want to be in trouble")
- Empathetic (e.g., "my friend feels sad")

A few minor categories were also observed, and a few reasons could not be deciphered. Three reasons emerged as major reasons for all actions: "principle," "consequences to self," and "relationship."

Look/find. The reasons given for the action "look/find" were "relationship" and "consequences to self." "Relationship" was more important to the first and second graders, the comparison third grade classes, and the intervention fourth grade class. "Consequences to self" was the dominant reason given by fifth graders. The raters concluded that

Table 2

Percentage "Sorry" Response to Item 1 as a Function of Grade and Intervention Status

	Comparison Classes			Intervention Classes		
Response	N	Fall	Spring	N	Fall	Spring
Grade 4	29			17		
First Response		0.0	3.4		0.0	0.0
Second Response		6.9	10.3		5.9	29.4
Third Response		0.0	0.0		0.0	5.9
Grade 5	11			28		
First Response		0.0	0.0		7.1	21.4
Second Response		18.2	0.0		3.6	10.7
Third Response		0.0	0.0		14.3	0.0
Grade 6	17			20		
First Response		0.0	11.8		20.0	0.0
Second Response		29.4	17.6		5.0	10.0
Third Response		0.0	0.0		0.0	5.0

"relationship" and "consequences to self" may be two sides of the same coin: the loss of a friend might be hurtful to self.

Replace. For all grades, the dominant reasons given for the action "replace" were "principle" (e.g., "it's the right thing to do") and "consequences to self" (e.g., "I want to be nice"). This may be an example of the child's internalization of society's definitions of appropriate behavior, an internalization resulting in a positive self-image. There was little mention of "relationship" in sixth grade responses.

Tell. "Consequences to self" was the primary reason for the action "tell" for all grades except the sixth grade which cited "relationship" as the primary reason. Additionally, a sizable number of fifth grade intervention students identified "principle" as their reason for "telling."

Sorry. Where "sorry" appeared as a first choice action in the fifth and sixth grades, the reason given was "relationship."

Item 2. *Pretend that you see another child at school, whom you do not know, being picked on and called names.*

First action responses for Item 2, *Student empathy with a peer who is not a friend,* fell into three major categories:

- Intervene
- Tell an Adult
- Stay Out

Other actions included befriending the victim, joining in, and advising the victim. The major categories are presented in Table 3.

The students overwhelmingly chose to either "intervene" or "tell an adult." In the "Voices of Love and Freedom" first, second, fourth, and sixth grade classes, the number of students choosing "intervene" increased between administrations of the instrument . The only comparison class to show an increase between administrations was the third grade comparison class in which a one-student gain occurred.

Apparently, students felt the only viable alternative to personal intervention was to "tell an adult." In grades one through five, "telling an adult" rose between administrations of the instrument. In grades five and six, a sizable number of students listed their action as "stay out" (Table 4).

In the first grade comparison class, Fall administration of the instrument, 22.2% of the class responded that they would "befriend the victim." This percentage dropped in the Spring administration to 5.6%. Befriending the victim was not given serious consideration

Table 3

Percentage First Action Response to Item 2 as a Function of Grade and Intervention Status

	Comparison Classes			Intervention Classes		
Response	N	Fall	Spring	N	Fall	Spring
Grade 1	18			53		
Intervene		44.4	22.2		39.6	47.2
Tell adult		27.8	61.1		41.5	37.7
Grade 2	16			16		
Intervene		75.0	25.0		62.5	68.8
Tell adult		18.8	56.3		12.5	25.0
Grade 3	37			13		
Intervene		35.1	37.8		61.5	23.1
Tell adult		51.4	45.9		30.8	53.8
Grade 4	29			17		
Intervene		37.9	31.0		29.4	47.1
Tell adult		51.7	44.8		64.7	35.3
Grade 5	11			28		
Intervene		63.6	45.5		50.0	46.4
Tell adult		18.2	54.5		21.4	21.4
Grade 6	17			20		
Intervene		47.1	41.2		50.0	60.0
Tell adult		41.2	35.3		30.0	15.0

Table 4

Percentage "Staying Out" Response to Item 2 as a Function of Grade and Intervention Status

	Comparison Classes			Intervention Classes		
Response	N	Fall	Spring	N	Fall	Spring
Grade 5	11			28		
Staying out		9.1	0.0		0.0	21.4
Grade 6	17			20		
Staying out		11.8	17.6		5.0	15.0

by any other class or grade in any administration of the instrument.

Intervene. The reasons given for the action "intervene" were the following:

- Principle
- Relationship
- Consequences to Others
- Consequences to Self (e.g., "to be nice")
- Judgment (e.g., "they're bad")
- Empathetic (differentiated from "consequences to others" in its demonstration of more highly developed perspective-taking)

The first and second graders favored reasons related to "relationship" and "consequences to others." In the second-grade intervention, within both the first and second administrations of the instrument, "empathetic" reasons were cited.

The third grade also expressed empathy. "Empathetic" and "consequences to others" were the reasons for intervening in the fourth grade, along with "consequences to self." Among sixth graders choosing to "intervene," "empathetic" reasons were also cited.

Tell adult. Reasons for the action "tell adult" were largely to allow the adults to handle the problem, i.e., "pass off." The number of students reasoning "pass off" dropped off in the sixth grade while "consequences to self" rose. Concern for the unknown child, i.e., "consequence to others," was a major reason given. Although there were responses coded as "empathetic," "relationship" was insignificant after the second grade.

Stay out. The fifth grade intervention class gave the reason "judgment" for the action "stay out." In the sixth grade, however, another reason to stay out was "consequences to self" (e.g., "I'll get in trouble" or "I'll get hurt").

Item 3. *Pretend that you are in a store in your neighborhood. You find a wallet with money in it.*

First action responses for Item 3, *Student relationship and involvement with community,* fell into five major categories:

- Return to Owner
- Give to Store Personnel
- Give to Police
- Ignore
- Keep (either the wallet or just the money)

There was one other category, "give to parent." Few children considered this as an option. The major categories are presented in Table 5.

Reasons for action included the following:

- Principle
- Consequences to Self
- Negative (e.g., "I don't want any trouble")
- Consequences to Self

- Positive (e.g., "there might be a reward")
- Empathy
- Pass Off (e.g., "so that a grown up can handle it")

Return/give to store/give to police. Most of the students wanted the owner of the wallet to have the wallet back. There were few other trends or patterns in the responses to this item. Actions to return the wallet to the rightful owner included returning it directly, without others' intervention; giving the wallet to the cashier or manager who would take the responsibility of returning it; and taking the wallet to the police. In the first three grades the reasons for these actions were "principle," "consequences to other," and "empathy," respectively. The "empathy" responses were especially poignant: "They might need the money to buy food for the children."

Throughout all grades the students reported that they would return the wallet in expectation of receiving a reward. One student commented that the reward might be more than the money in the wallet. Even then, "consequences to self" was not the major reason for returning the wallet.

By the fourth grade, students began to be concerned with how their finding the wallet might be perceived and provided reasons related to "consequences to self" -- e.g., "they might think I stole it."

Ignore/keep. The more seemingly antisocial actions were to "ignore the wallet" or to "keep the wallet." "Ignoring the wallet" was chosen largely for reasons of "consequences to self," i.e., to avoid suspicion or trouble. However, there were cases where the student reasoned that the owner would know where he/she lost it and would come back for it later. "Keeping the wallet" was also explained in terms of "consequences to self," i.e., to have the money. Fifth graders showed signs of temptation, and by the sixth grade the numbers of students who would keep the money, even if they returned the wallet, had increased.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5

Percentage First Action Response to Item 3 as a Function of Grade and Intervention Status

	Comparison Classes			Intervention Classes		
Response	N	Fall	Spring	N	Fall	Spring
Grade 1	18			53		
Return		22.2	38.9		41.5	54.7
Give store		50.0	38.9		5.7	17.0
Give police		5.6	16.7		17.0	13.2
Ignore		11.1	5.6		7.5	7.5
Keep		5.6	0.0		1.9	3.8
Grade 2	16			16		
Return		31.3	68.8		56.3	62.5
Give store		12.5	18.8		0.0	6.3
Give police		31.3	0.0		12.5	12.5
Ignore		0.0	12.5		0.0	6.3
Keep		18.8	0.0		25.0	6.3
Grade 3	37			13		
Return		48.6	18.9		23.1	15.4
Give store		13.5	45.9		15.4	38.5
Give police		21.6	2.7		23.1	23.1
Ignore		0.0	13.3		0.0	7.7
Keep		10.8	2.7		30.8	7.7

Table 5, Cont.

Percentage First Action Response to Item 3 as a Function of Grade and Intervention Status

	Comparison Classes			Intervention Classes		
Response	N	Fall	Spring	N	Fall	Spring
Grade 4	29			17		
Return		41.4	53.2		47.1	41.2
Give store		27.6	24.1		47.1	41.2
Give police		17.2	10.3		0.0	11.8
Ignore		10.3	10.3		0.0	0.0
Keep		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
Grade 5	11			28		
Return		54.3	18.2		35.7	25.0
Give store		9.1	52.9		25.0	28.6
Give police		0.0	54.5		3.6	14.3
Ignore		36.4	0.0		14.3	7.1
Keep		0.0	9.1		3.6	14.3
Grade 6	17			20		
Return		35.3	0.0		40.0	40.0
Give store		11.8	52.9		25.0	15.0
Give police		5.9	23.5		5.0	30.0
Ignore		29.4	0.0		25.0	0.0
Keep		5.9	23.5		0.0	15.0

Item 4. *Pretend that a teacher accuses you of cheating when you did not cheat.*

First actions responses for Item 4, *Student response to authority* revealed four major categories included the following:

- Deny (e.g., "tell the teacher I didn't cheat")
- Tell My Parent
- Prove that I Didn't Cheat
- Do Nothing

Table 6 presents these responses.

First and second graders felt they could settle the problem by telling the teacher that they did not cheat. These students seemed to expect that their word would be accepted as the truth. Many fifth graders indicated that they did not expect to be taken at their word, but rather had to seek a way to prove that they did not cheat. A large segment of the sixth graders indicated they would do nothing.

Deny. The reasons for the action "deny" included the following:

- Principle (e.g., "because I didn't cheat")
- Relationship Positive (e.g., "she'd believe me")
- Efficacy Positive (e.g., "so she will know")
- Efficacy Negative (e.g., "so I won't be accused again")
- Consequences to Self (e.g., "to avoid trouble")

The primary reason for "deny" in the first and second grades was "principle." The third graders reported they would deny cheating for reasons related to "consequences to self. In the second grade intervention class it was noted that "positive efficacy" was the reasoning. Fourth through sixth graders who responded with the action "deny" reasoned "principle," "consequences to self," and "positive efficacy."

Tell parent. The reasons given for telling the parent were also "principle," "positive efficacy" and "consequences to self." There were no notable grade or class patterns.

Table 6

Percentage First Action Response to Item 4 as a Function of Grade and Intervention Status

	Comparison Classes			Intervention Classes		
Response	N	Fall	Spring	N	Fall	Spring
Grade 1	18			53		
Deny		55.6	55.6		58.5	67.9
Tell parent		11.1	22.2		9.4	7.5
Prove		0.0	11.1		0.0	5.7
Nothing		11.1	5.6		3.8	3.8
Grade 2	16			16		
Deny		43.8	81.3		75.0	75.0
Tell parent		25.0	0.0		6.3	0.0
Prove		0.0	0.0		0.0	6.3
Nothing		18.8	12.5		0.0	0.0
Grade 3	37			13		
Deny		59.5	54.1		53.8	92.3
Tell parent		18.9	16.2		23.1	7.7
Prove		0.0	8.1		0.0	0.0
Nothing		13.5	2.7		0.0	0.0
Grade 4	29			17		
Deny		48.3	62.1		47.1	64.7
Tell parent		6.9	6.9		23.9	11.8
Prove		10.3	10.3		0.0	0.0
Nothing		17.2	13.8		5.9	5.9

Table 6, Cont.

Percentage First Action Response to Item 4 as a Function of Grade and Intervention Status

	Comparison Classes			Intervention Classes		
Response	N	Fall	Spring	N	Fall	Spring
Grade 5	11			28		
Deny		45.5	45.5		78.6	60.7
Tell parent		18.2	18.2		3.6	10.7
Prove		36.4	18.2		14.3	14.3
Nothing		0.0	0.0		0.0	10.7
Grade 6	17			20		
Deny		47.1	47.1		50.0	55.0
Tell parents		17.6	23.5		5.0	5.0
Prove		11.8	5.9		25.0	20.0
Nothing		23.5	17.4		25.0	10.0

Prove I didn't cheat. The action of proving innocence became apparent from the fourth to the sixth grades. "Principle" was the major reason for this action; however, "consequences to self" and "positive efficacy" were also reported.

Do nothing. What was disturbing was the number of students who would do nothing. The main reason for this action was equally disturbing: because you shouldn't talk back or be disrespectful to adults. "Consequences to self" and "negative efficacy" were also reasons given for this non-action, as was "relationship negative" (e.g., "she won't believe me).

Item 5. *Pretend that you see your little brother or sister steal candy from a store.*

First actions responses for Item 5, an examination of *student/family relationship*, provided five major categories:

- Return Candy to Shelf
- Make or Tell Sibling to Return
- Tell Parent
- Tell Store Owners/Managers
- Spank/Holler at Sibling

There were also a few responses that suggested paying for the candy, telling the police, doing nothing, or keeping the candy. Responses to this item are reported in Table 7. Over all grades, the first action responses involved the return of the merchandise.

Return. The first, second, and third graders reported they would prefer to tell the parent. The reasons for the action "return," were primarily either "consequences to other" (e.g., "he might get caught") or "relationship" (e.g., "I don't want my sister to get in trouble").

Make/tell return. The fourth, fifth, and sixth graders reported they would return the merchandise for the younger sibling. The primary reason cited for making or telling the sibling to return the candy was "principle" and "consequences to other."

Tell the parent. "Tell the parent" was the third action of importance. Reasons cited, to protect or teach the sibling, were related to "consequences to other" and "relationship."

Tell the store manager. "Tell the store manager" was not a serious consideration before the fourth grade, and at no grade level was it a second choice (Table 8).

Spank/holler at sibling. Researchers noted a pattern throughout all grade levels and in intervention classes as well as comparison classes of responses which included physical punishment. Given the intervention's expressed purpose of reducing violence, and given the students' expressions of positive reasoning, this pattern is especially surprising.

Table 7

Percentage First Action Response to Item 5 as a Function of Grade and Intervention Status

	Comparison Classes			Intervention Classes		
Response	N	Fall	Spring	N	Fall	Spring
Grade 1	18			53		
Return		16.7	11.1		13.2	30.2
Make/tell		44.4	55.6		45.3	30.2
Tell parent		27.8	27.8		26.4	22.6
Spank		5.6	5.6		1.9	3.8
Grade 2	16			16		
Return		12.5	12.5		6.3	37.5
Make/tell		5.3	31.3		56.3	20.0
Tell parent		25.0	18.8		12.5	18.8
Spank		12.5	18.8		6.3	6.3
Grade 3	37			13		
Return		18.9	24.3		15.4	23.1
Make/tell		35.1	29.7		53.8	23.1
Tell parent		29.7	35.1		23.1	30.8
Spank		10.8	2.7		15.4	15.4
Grade 4	29			17		
Return		17.2	24.1		5.9	17.6
Make/tell		51.7	34.5		64.7	64.0
Tell parent		17.2	27.6		17.6	5.9
Spank		3.4	6.5		5.9	0.0

Table 7, Cont.

Percentage First Action Response to Item 5 as a Function of Grade and Intervention Status

	Comparison Classes			Intervention Classes		
Response	N	Fall	Spring	N	Fall	Spring
Grade 5	11			28		
Return		27.3	27.3		7.1	10.7
Make/tell		54.5	72.7		42.5	46.4
Tell parent		9.1	27.3		21.4	21.4
Spank		0.0	0.0		10.7	7.1
Grade 6	17			20		
Return		17.6	5.5		10.0	25.0
Make/tell		47.1	41.2		55.0	70.0
Tell parent		5.9	17.6		25.0	5.0
Spank		11.8	11.8		20.0	5.0

Conclusions

Preliminary findings suggested that prosocial development might be more complex than previously believed. Rather than considering these attitudes in terms of developmental sequences across situations, it might be more appropriate to consider them in terms of changing contextual factors in children's understanding of their world and relationships therein.

Two other components of the evaluation design of the intervention were qualitative. One was a case study focusing on the classroom implementation of "Voices of Love and

Freedom." In this case study it was found that teachers' rates of implementation differed. In addition, some teachers expressed anxiety over the "proper" implementation and over the time taken from teaching skills that the teachers perceived to be more important. Several teachers were reported to be uncertain of the program's purpose.

The other study concentrated on teachers' personal construct psychology (Huffman, 1994). The findings of this study suggest that individual teachers' personal constructs may inhibit or enhance this intervention's effectiveness. For example, Huffman found that one of the teachers was a constructivist teacher who wanted the students to take

Table 8

Percentage "Tell Store Manager" Response to Item 5 as a Function of Grade and Intervention Status

	Comparison Classes			Intervention Classes		
Response	N	Fall	Spring	N	Fall	Spring
Grade 4	29			17		
First Response		6.9	0.0		5.9	0.0
Second Response		3.4	0.0		0.0	29.4
Grade 5	11			28		
First Response		18.2	0.0		14.3	7.1
Second Response		0.0	0.0		10.8	3.6
Grade 6	17			20		
First Response		11.8	0.0		10.0	5.0
Second Response		5.9	0.0		0.0	0.0

charge of their learning. This teacher's personal constructs were a "perfect fit" with the program. Another teacher's practices of cooperative learning also enhanced the program. On the other hand, although one teacher embraced the superordinate goals of the intervention, the teacher demonstrated a lack of ability to take the children's perspective. In one case the intervention enabled a teacher to rationalize open discussion of religion in the classroom.

When we compare these elements of teachers' personal constructs with the children's responses of actions and reasons, we can understand many of the apparent discrepancies in ethical awareness across the intervention and comparison classes. Yet there were sufficient indications that the intervention, or at least classroom discussions of an ethical nature, made enough differences to justify a conclusion that teaching ethical awareness was beneficial.

Although verbalized behavior and actual behavior may differ at times, meanings articulated by a child are believed to be more highly related to actual behavior than other components (Levitt, et al., 1991). We feel this instrument is especially telling of actual behavior because the participant is not asked to suggest appropriate behavior for some other hypothetical child, but rather is asked to share how the participant himself or herself would behave. We feel this is one of the major strengths of PAB.

References

Chazan, B. (1985). Contemporary approaches to moral education: Analyzing alternative theories. New York: Teachers College Press.

Collins, C. (1987). Review article: Philosophy of education on moral development and moral education. Educational Theory, 37 (1), 89-97.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Huffman, S. B. (1994, July). Hearing the voices of teachers: Unfolding a way to listen. Paper presented at the North American Personal Construct Network, Indianapolis, IN.

Keller, M., & Edelstein, W. (1985, June). Reasoning about promise keeping: The early development of interpersonal-moral concern. Paper presented at the 15th Annual Symposium of the Jean Piaget Society, Philadelphia, PA.

Kincaid, J. P., Fishburne, R. P., Rogers, R. L., & Chissom, B. S. (1975). Derivation of new readability formulas (automated readability index, fog count, and Flesch reading ease formula) for Navy enlisted personnel. Navy Training Command Research Branch Report, 8-75.

Levitt, M. Z., Selman, R. L., & Richmond, J. B. (1991). The psychosocial foundations of early adolescents' high-risk behavior: Implications for research and practice. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 1 (4), 349-378.

Rich, J. M. & DeVitis, J. L. (1985). Theories of moral development. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Suriani, M., & Wasson, R. (1994, November). Assessment of an intervention addressing literacy and ethics. Paper presented the annual meeting of the Mid-South Education Research Association, Nashville, TN.